

Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/686,697	KOHL ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Sin J. Lee	1795	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Sin J. Lee. (3) Mr. Bernard Berman (attorney for applicants).
 (2) Ms. Kelly Carden (attorney for applicants). (4) _____.

Date of Interview: 22 September 2008.

Type: a) Telephonic b) Video Conference
 c) Personal [copy given to: 1) applicant 2) applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) Yes e) No.
 If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: all.

Identification of prior art discussed: Teng'208 & Mastrangelo et al'212.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) was reached. g) was not reached. h) N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Discussed prior art rejections of Office action of 02/19/2008. Ms. Carden and Mr. Berman explained the difference between Mastrangelo et al'212 and present invention (also discussed claims of 11/451,144 which is a continuation of present application).

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

/Sin J. Lee/ Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1795	
---	--